FOREWORD

In the Netherlands, before World War II training and research in Social or cultural anthropology was mainly focused on the cultures of Indonesia. This applies particularly to Leiden University, which was one of the two centres for the training of administrative and legal officers for service in the Netherlands East Indies. This means that most anthropological fieldwork in Indonesia was carried out by these officers and by Catholic and Protestant missionaries, who had received instruction in anthropology as part of their university curriculum, and who were sufficiently interested in that subject to carry out research as amateur anthropologists after taking up their posts in the colony. In addition, a small minority of pre-war Dutch anthropological publications was due to members of the specialized corps of "Taal-ambtenaren", literally "Language officers", who were employed full-time in linguistic and/or anthropological research.

Given the huge extent of Indonesia and the number and variety of the cultures in that area it was a problem, both didactic and scientific, whether, and if so how, one could gather these manifold societies into the single fold of "Indonesian Studies". J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, appointed to the Leiden chair of Indonesian and General Anthropology in 1935, addressed himself to this problem in his inaugural oration. In it, he developed the concept of Indonesia as an "Ethnologisch Studieveld", which may be translated as "Field of Anthropological Study".1 In this address (published, and later translated into English) he draws attention to a number of phenomena which "will ... reveal at least something of the unity" of this Field of Anthropological Study, and which are common, not to all, but to "numerous ancient Indonesian cultures in many parts of the Archipelago". This exposé by De Josselin de Jong was made programmatic by his students, who in their single-society or comparative studies paid special attention to these features, also called the "structural core" elements, which "reveal something of the unity" of the entire Field. Steps towards carrying out this programme were consistently made until, roughly, the achievement of independence by Indonesia, which changed the whole situation.

In the later fifties and early sixties Indonesian studies were in the doldrums in the Netherlands, but since then there has been a marked revival of Indonesian language and literature studies and anthropology, particularly (but by no means only) in Leiden. This has also meant a renewed interest in, and a first critical revision of, the notion of Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study (henceforth to be abbreviated as FAS in this volume). Chapter I may serve as an outline of the ways in which the FAS-concept has
been applied in the pre- and post-war years.

One thing should be made clear, as there may be some misunderstand­ing on this point. The Indonesianist anthropologists who are in sympathy with the FAS-approach do not make the FAS the object of their investigation, but they use it as a research tool. In other words, the aim of their studies is not to construct or reconstruct a picture of Indonesia as a FAS; they carry out the "normal" or usual type of anthropological research, in the field and/or in the li­brary, mostly on a single culture or aspects of it, but in doing so they are also concerned with the question whether the FAS-proc­edure can help them to understand features of their "own" so­ciety, and whether the data they have obtained can be of service to our conspectus of Indonesian societies as a whole, i.e. to our insights into what constitutes the FAS.

Around the year 1980 such studies - however limited in number and scope - had reached a point that a group of Indonesianist anthropologists had come into being who could at least raise, if not answer, certain fundamental questions: to what extent has the FAS-concept been revised since 1935, and what needs to be done to improve its usefulness? It was also considered undesirable that these questions should continue to be discussed only within a group virtually limited to Leiden University staff and graduates. If they were brought before an international forum, we in Leiden could benefit from the critical comments by colleagues working in dif­ferent traditions, while the attention of our guests could be drawn to the uses of the FAS-approach, of which they are usually unaware.

The publication of three books converted the idea of an in­ternational discussion from a vague optative to a definite plan: The Flow of Life. Essays on Eastern Indonesia, edited by James J. Fox (1980) and the twin volumes of S.O.A.S. papers published in 1978: Nature and Man in South East Asia, edited by P.A. Stott and reviewed by Leontine E. Visser in BKI 136(1980):186-7; and G.B. Milner (ed.), Natural Symbols in South East Asia, reviewed by P.E. de Josselin de Jong in the same issue, pp. 153-156. The first book, dedicated "To the memory of J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong and F.A.E. van Wouden", is a "critical commentary on a classic work in Dutch anthropology that defined [the islands of eastern Indonesia] as a 'field of ethnological study'". The reviewers of the two other collaborative volumes both note that the data presented raise im­portant questions concerning the delimitation of the "ethnologisch studieveld", but that these questions are not discussed - and prob­ably not perceived - by the contributing authors.

Invitations to an international symposium on "Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study" were therefore sent out, and the symposium was held in Leiden from 22 to 26 November, 1982.

The following procedure was adopted. Indonesianist anthropologists, and a smaller group of linguists, at present or until recently attached to Leiden University, first prepared their papers. Sum­maries of these were distributed to all invited participants, but the complete text of each paper was offered to one colleague
abroad who had agreed to be the "discussant" for that particular text. During the symposium, each original paper and its discussant's comments were read in full, and followed by a general discussion. The chapters of the present volume each consist of the Leiden contributor's and the discussant's papers. A few explanatory notes are required at this point.

The formula "original paper from Leiden, discussant's from abroad" was not applied rigidly, for various reasons. At the symposium, the paper on Austronesian linguistics was read by Dr. J.C. Anceaux, who holds the Leiden chair of Indonesian and Oceanian Linguistics, while the discussant, Dr. Robert A. Blust, is a member of the same department. However, as a U.S. citizen who studied and obtained his doctorate at the University of Hawaii, we felt he could fittingly represent the "foreign" (i.e. non-Dutch) viewpoint. The situation in Chapter V is the reverse of Chapter II. Dr. David S. Moyer, born in Montreal, Canada, and Professor of Anthropology at University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, was considered a Leidenaar honoris causa on the grounds of his several postgraduate years in Leiden, where he was also granted his Ph. D. Finally, in Chapter III the discussant for Professor Teeuw's paper was the Leiden University staff member Ms. Postel, simply because she was eminently suited to act in this capacity.

It will be seen that Chapters VIII and XI include no discussant's papers. Renée Hagesteijn (Chapter VIII) sent in her paper, but was unable to attend the symposium as she was carrying out her postgraduate research abroad at the time; it therefore appeared pointless to invite a discussant or to comment on her paper during the sessions. Professor Needham's paper (Chapter XI) was meant by the organizers to conclude the symposium; it was read in the university's central building, and had the character of a public lecture.

Chapter XII is not a symposium paper. The original plan was that our publication should reflect at least the main points raised during the discussion sessions. Therefore, the Leiden participants were to present their reactions to the discussants' comments on their own papers, and all participants would submit critical notes on any of the topics discussed. On second thoughts, however, this plan was abandoned, as it would probably cause inordinate delay before the entire manuscript could go to the press. Instead, the volume now ends with the editor's review of the symposium's results, and his personal reactions, both positive and negative. The draft of Chapter XII was submitted to all participants for corrections, in case their views were misrepresented. This does not mean that they signified their agreement with what is said in that chapter — nor were they asked to do so.

The great majority of the discussants are, it will be seen, from western Europe: France, Germany, Great Britain and Switzerland. The reason for this was simply that the organizing committee had only limited funds available for the foreign participants' travel expenses. It was therefore a great pleasure that Dr. Masinambow's participation was made possible by the Indonesian-Netherlands Cultural Convention, and Professor Moyer's by the University of Victoria. This is the occasion to express our gratitude to both.
It should be made clear that, while the discussants are of very diverse provenance and their work belongs to various academic traditions, the Leiden group is not homogeneous either. In the first place it is obvious that the linguists, viz. Anceaux (see note 2), Blust and Teeuw are clearly distinct from the anthropologists, but it would be erroneous to consider the latter as a solid block, representing a Leiden school of FAS-devotees.

On the one hand there are contributors to the present volume who have quite close contacts with each other, and who have been actively concerned with the FAS-procedure for at least several years: De Josselin de Jong, Moyer, Niessen, Platenkamp, Postel and Visser. The interest of others in that approach is much more recent, and marginal to their main research activities. This applies to Hagesteijn, a member of the very active Leiden group of evolutionary anthropologists, and above all to Nas and Wuisman: strictly speaking not anthropologists but graduates in the "Sociology of non-western societies", a typically Dutch term which might be translated either as "applied anthropology" or as "development sociology".

It is a pleasure to conclude this foreword with sincerest thanks to all who not only enabled the symposium to take place and this volume to appear, but also made the symposium a smoothly running, stimulating and useful enterprise. The first words of thanks should go to all participants for their whole-hearted cooperation, and to the Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology for publishing the symposium papers in its Verhandelingen series. In addition, thanks are due to the following persons and institutions.

The Leids Universiteits-Fonds for its subsidy, generously and promptly granted.

The Institute of Cultural and Social Studies, Leiden University, for office facilities and various forms of financial and other assistance.

Ms. A. Amesz and Ms. L. Willemstein of that Institute, for willingly taking on a considerable load of secretarial work.

Ms. Sandra A. Niessen, who acted as "social secretary" and Ms. Leontine E. Visser, for their great assistance and initiative in planning the symposium and in the logistics of transport, accommodation, etc.

Mr. C.H.M. van Nispen, ever-reliable and scrupulous treasurer.

As Indonesia was the central theme of the conference, the interest shown by Mr. Soedarso Soepadmo, Cultural Attaché of the Indonesian Embassy in The Hague, was greatly appreciated.

The Editor.

NOTES
1 Or Ethnological Study, or Studies. All versions, which may be taken as synonymous, are used by contributors in the following pages, but "Field of Anthropological Study", abbreviated as FAS, came to be adopted as the standard phrase.

2 Unfortunately, various circumstances prevented Professor Anceaux from contributing a definitive written version of his paper to the present volume.